

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 and drawing Figs. 13b, 15 and 26 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiners Lam and Vu in the July 18 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

As discussed at the personal interview, independent claims 1 and 10 are amended to change "output signal" to "digital signal" to correct this informality. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 1 and 10 set forth in the Office Action is respectfully requested.

Further, replacement sheets for drawing Figs. 13b and 26 are submitted to obviate the objects set forth in the Office Action. Fig. 13b is amended to include the legend "Prior Art" and Fig. 26 is amended to correct the spelling of "pattern recognition." Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

A replacement sheet for Fig. 15 is also submitted to properly illustrate data transfer lines 250_n, raw image data buffer 460 and data transfer lines 500_n in dashed lines.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution); (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendments are necessary to correct informalities and were not earlier presented because they are made in response to the final rejection. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication that claims 16 and 19 include allowable subject matter. However, for the reasons discussed at the personal interview and discussed further below, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are allowable over the references of record.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 6,115,066 to Gowda in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,196,938 to Blessinger; rejects claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Blessinger in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,636,254 to Onishi; rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Blessinger in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,115,066 to Gowda; rejects claims 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Blessinger in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,805,224 to Koezuka. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

As discussed and agreed during the personal interview, Blessinger does not disclose "a selector selecting, among the plurality of consecutive frames, at least one frame based on the processed result signals for the plurality of consecutive frames," as reflected in the Examiners' Interview Summary. More specifically, as explained by Applicants' representative, the key pad 38 referred to in the Office Action does not perform "selecting" as recited in claim 1, but only receives input to control the operation of fast frame recorder 10. (Col. 4, lns. 41-43 et seq.) Further, the storage of frames by the fast frame recorder 10 is based on a trigger signal generated by an external event, not based on processed results. Thus, Blessinger does not teach or suggest a selector as recited in independent claim 1. Applicants appreciate the Examiners' agreement to withdraw the Final Rejection in view of this patentable distinction.

During the personal interview, the Examiners requested that support for this feature be indicated in the specification. Applicants respectfully submit that this feature is supported by at least lines 1-2 on page 7, lines 20-21 on page 7, lines 7-9 on page 12, and lines 8-10 on page 62, and the surrounding text, as well as the descriptions provided by page 53, line 17, to


page 56, line 2, page 72, lines 13-23, page 85, line 6, to page 87, line 19, and page 95, lines 4-24. See also Figs. 12, 25 and 27(b).

Also during the personal interview, Applicants' representative discussed reasons why the asserted combination of Blessinger and Koezuka is improper. However, in light of the agreement that none of the other references of record remedy the deficiencies of Blessinger with respect to claim 1, the issue is moot.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Klifton L. Kime
Registration No. 42,733

JAO:KLK/hs

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Replacement Drawing Sheets (3)

Date: August 2, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
